DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 121 731 95 SP 009 991

AUTHOR Milczarek, Gary
TITLE Interim Milestone Cycle 1 Evaluation Progress Report. Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving.
INSTITUTION Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Basic Skills Group. Learning Div.
PUB DATE Jan 76
CONTRACT NE-C-00-3-0072
NOTE 33p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Conflict; *Conflict Resolution; *Course Evaluation; *Interpersonal Competence; *Problem Solving; Program Evaluation; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Negotiation

ABSTRACT

This progress report contains a summary of an evaluation of the Cycle I field trial of the Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving instructional system, which was developed by the Improving Teaching Competencies Program of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. The evaluation was done to document the field trial workshop, collect data for reporting development and evaluation progress to the National Institute of Education, and provide information helpful to the developers in strengthening the instructional system. The report contains three sections: (1) the evaluation method which summarizes background information about the test site and participants and outlines the evaluation activities; (2) the evaluation results; and (3) recommendations for development and evaluation. The report states that the field test and evaluation of the workshop were held with educators from four school districts in Orange County. It also states that the workshop had 13 objectives, some of which included: (1) accepting conflict as a natural part of social reality, (2) understanding the strengths and weaknesses of alternative ways of coping with conflict, (3) understanding a negotiative problem solving model, (4) increasing ability to recognize legitimate self-interests in conflict situations, (5) understanding the phenomeuon of power, and (6) integrating workshop learnings and applying them to home settings. According to the report, results of the evaluation indicated that most participants rated the workshop as helpful in attaining most of the 13 goals. Tables and references are included. (CD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED121731

INTERIM MILESTONE CYCLE 1 EVALUATION PROGRESS REPORT

SOCIAL CONFLICT AND NEGOTIATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING

Gary Milczarek

JANUARY 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

Improving Teaching Competencies Program

500 Lindsay Building · 710 S.W. Second Avenue · Portland, Oregon 97204 · Telephone (503) 224-3650

SP009 991

January 1976

Published by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, a private nonprofit corporation. The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract NE-C-00-3-0072, with the Basic Skills Group/Learning Dividion of the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 710 S.W. Second Avenue, Portland, Oregon 9 204

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
METHOD	3
RESULTS	5
Rationale, Goals and Objectives	5
Instructional Content	8
Instructional Procedures	10
Dissemination	15
Participant Satisfaction	15
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION	18
REFERENCES	20
APPENDIX	21
Appendix A	21

INTRODUCTION

This progress report contains a summary of the Cycle 1 field trial of the *Social Conflict and Negotative Problem Solving* instructional system (Lohman and Wilson, 1975). This workshop was developed by the Improving Teaching Competencies Program (ITCP) of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL). A description of the instructional system can be found in the *Pilot Milestone Report for Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving* (Milczarek, 1975).

The management plan for the Improving Teaching Competencies Program (see *RAMP*, 1974) divides the work flow for development and evaluation of an instructional system into five phases: planning, pilot, interim, field and outcome. Development activities differ somewhat according to the phase of development. These activities were explicated in the *Planning Milestone Report* (Lohman, Milczarek and Germann, 1974) and a truncated revision of this plan has been followed. A more detailed discussion of each stage can be found in the *Planning Milestone Report*. This Cycle 1 field trial was the first workshop of the interim milestone and fifth since development began in the Spring of 1974. The workshop was conducted in Orange County, California, in July of 1975. The purpose of the workshop was to provide the developers with an opportunity to test their recently revised instructional materials and strategies and to gain experience and information that would help them strengthen the instructional system. The purpose of the evaluation was to document the workshop, to collect data for reporting development and evaluation progress to the National Institute of Education (NIE), and to provide information helpful to the developers in strengthening the instructional system. The purpose of this report is to summarize for NIE the development and evaluation progress relating to the workshop field trial.

The report contains three sections: (a) the evaluation method which summarizes background information about the test site and participants, and outlines the evaluation activities; (b) the evaluation results and (c) recommendations for development and evaluation.

METHOD

Several other workshops developed by ITCP had been field tested in Orange County under the direction of Dr. William Ward, ITCP Director of Dissemination and Field Relations. Many of the participants of these workshops expressed an interest in the *Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving* program. Following up on this expressed interest, Dr. Ward made arrangements for a field trial of the conflict workshop. On-site assistance in recruiting participants and arranging for facilities was provided by Dr. Tom Wilson, a participant of many of the other ITCP workshops.

The workshop was held in a large carpeted meeting area of an elementary school. The facilities were attractive, comfortable, free from interference and provided adequate space for the workshop activities.

A six-day schedule was followed beginning each day at 8:30 a.m. and ending at 5:00 p.m. There were also two evening sessions. A copy of the schedule can be found in the Instructional Materials (Lohman and Wilson, 1975).

Trainers for the workshop included Dr. John Lohman and Dr. Gretchen Wilson. These people developed the materials and had been the trainers for all previous workshops.

Most of the workshop participants were educators from four school districts in Orange County. Two participants were not employed in education. The educational roles of the other participants included ten administrators, four teachers, three counselors and one community liaison. There were 12 male and 8 female participants. There were no racial minorities. Of the 20 participants, 17 had previously participated in other ITCP workshops. Two participants had previous experience in

salary and policy negotiations but no conflict training in the past. Participants expectations for what would be learned from the workshop included dealing with and resolving conflicts, preventing conflicts, increasing personal awareness, understanding and skills for dealing with conflict, gaining skills in conflict management, and gaining confidence in dealing with conflict.

During the workshop, participants were asked to complete a variety of evaluation instruments to provide information that would hopefully be useful for improving the design and materials. All instruments were administered by the evaluator. They included a Background Questionnaire to obtain biographical information plus previous similar training or experience and workshop expectations; a Session Evaluation Questionnaire to assess participants' reactions to particular materials and activities; and a Final Questionnaire to assess general satisfaction with the workshop. Copies of these instruments are provided in Appendix A. In addition, many activities were tape recorded and the evaluator kept a log of beginning and ending times and notes of important events. Some newsprint charts and participant artifacts such as worksheets and newsprints were also retained.

RESULTS

In this section the information obtained from the workshop field trial is presented. The results are organized around five major areas of concern: (a) the rationale, goals and objectives, (b) the instructional content, (c) the instructional procedures, (d) dissemination, and (e) participant satisfaction. For each area there is a presentation of the recent revisions in the instructional system and the information obtained at the workshop.

RATIONALE, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

By the end of the pilot milestone it had become clear that the formal statement of workshop objectives did not include explicit reference to some major elements of the instructional system: self-interest, power and back home application. New objectives were written for these three areas and some previous complex objectives were broken up into simpler parts. The new statement of objectives is as follows:

1. Accepting conflict as a natural part of social reality
2. Understanding your own style of coping with conflict
3. Increasing your awareness of alternative ways of coping with conflict
4. Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of alternative ways of coping with conflict
5. Understanding a negotiative problem solving model
6. Acquiring skills in a negotiative problem solving model
7. Increasing your ability to recognize your legitimate self-interests in conflict situations
8. Recognizing and accepting the legitimacy of self-interests of others
9. Understanding the phenomenon of power

10. Acquiring skills in using power

11. Describing, analyzing and diagnosing social conflict in organizational settings

12. Integrating your workshop learnings and applying them to your backhome setting

From the Final Questionnaire, 13 items assessed participants' perceptions of the extent to which they felt the workshop had helped them gain the skills and knowledge outlined in the workshop objectives. These results are given in Table 1. The results showed that participants thought the workshop was helpful in attaining all objectives (mode responses of 5 or 6 on 6-point scales); the highest rated were: "understanding major concepts and principles related to conflict and negotiative problem solving," "recognizing my legitimate self-interests in conflict situations," "accepting conflict as a natural part of social reality," and "gaining awareness of alternative ways of coping with conflict." The less favorably rated items included: "acquiring skills in a negotiative problem solving model," "acquiring skills in using power," and "understanding my own style of coping with conflict."

The results also indicate that Orange County participants were more positive than participants in the pilot workshops about their perceptions of the extent to which the workshop contributed to attaining the objectives.[a] There were 10 objectives for which there was comparable data. All 10 objectives received higher ratings from Orange County participants and 5 of these increases were statistically significant. Table 2 shows comparative data on these 10 objectives.

---

[a]During the pilot milestone, four workshops were conducted including 104 participants. See *Pilot Milestone Report*, (Milczarek, 1975).

Table 1

Participants' Perceptions of the Extent to Which the Workshop Helped Them Achieve Workshop Objectives

Question		Very Little Help 1	2	3	4	5	Great Amount Of Help 6	N	$\bar{X}$
Question 16:[a] Understanding a Negotiative Problem Solving Model	N	1	0	0	5	6	8	20	4.95
	%	5	0	0	25	30	40		
Question 17: Acquiring skills in a Negotiative Problem Solving Model	N	1	0	2	5	10	2	20	4.45
	%	5	0	10	25	50	10		
Question 18: Understanding your own style of coping with conflict	N	0	0	2	6	7	5	20	4.75
	%	0	0	10	30	35	25		
Question 19: Gaining awareness of alternative ways of coping with conflict	N	0	0	0	2	12	6	20	5.20
	%	0	0	0	10	60	30		
Question 20: Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of alternative ways of coping with conflict	N	0	0	0	6	11	3	20	4.85
	%	0	0	0	30	55	15		
Question 21: Describing, analyzing and diagnosing social conflict in organizational settings	N	0	0	0	6	8	5	19	4.95
	%	0	0	0	37	42	26		
Question 22: Accepting conflict as a natural part of social reality	N	0	0	2	1	6	11	20	5.30
	%	0	0	10	5	30	55		
Question 23: Applying your workshop learnings to your backhome setting	N	0	1	1	2	12	4	20	4.85
	%	0	5	5	10	60	20		
Question 24: Understanding the phenomena of power	N	0	0	0	4	6	10	20	5.30
	%	0	0	0	20	30	50		
Question 25: Acquiring skills in using power	N	0	0	2	6	8	4	20	4.70
	%	0	0	10	30	40	20		
Question 26: Understanding major concepts and principles related to Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving	N	0	0	0	1	10	9	20	5.40
	%	0	0	0	5	50	45		

[a] In order to adequately assess the instructional system of the workshop, it is necessary to know as accurately as possible if it achieves the desired objectives. As a result of your participation in the workshop, how much help do you feel the system was to you in gaining skills and knowledge of the following?

Table 1 Continued

Question		Very Little Help 1	2	3	4	5	Great Amount Of Help 6	N	$\bar{X}$
Question 27: Recognizing ones legitimate self interests in conflict situations	N	0	0	0	3	6	11	20	5.40
	%	0	0	0	15	30	55		
Question 28: Recognizing and accepting the legitimacy of self interests of others	N	0	0	0	4	7	9	20	5.25
	%	0	0	0	20	35	45		

INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT

A number of revisions and additions in the content of the instructional system were made prior to the workshop. The theory papers on self-interest was rewritten and a shorter questionnaire provided for helping participants get in touch with their self-interests. The material used by participants as an aid in diagnosing conflict was revised and expanded. A comprehensive checklist of negotiation steps, skills and questions was developed as an aid for participants to both prepare for and evaluate their negotiations in the NOG simulation. NOG is the title of a simulation designed to help participants learn about negotiative problem solving. A reflection form was also added to help participants debrief the NOG simulation. A more detailed negotiative problem solving model was added to the Central Ideas Paper and the theory paper on power was slightly revised. New conceptual materials were developed on bargaining theory, escalation and de-escalation of conflict, and feelings associated with conflict. Finally, the negotiation resource papers were reviewed and some were dropped and a new one added.

Table 2

Comparison of Orange County and Pilot Test Participants on ratings of the extent to which the workshop helped them achieve Workshop Objectives

Objective	Orange County Participants			Pilot Test Participants			Difference		
	N	$\bar{X}$	S	N	$\bar{X}$	S	$\bar{X}$	t	p
Understanding a Negotiative Problem Solving Model	20	4.95	1.23	104	4.54	1.11	.41	1.45	NS
Acquiring skills in a Negotiative Problem Solving Model	20	4.45	1.14	104	3.87	1.25	.58	1.90	.05
Understanding your own style of coping with conflict	20	4.75	.96	104	4.34	1.22	.41	1.39	NS
Gaining awareness of alternative ways of coping with conflict	20	5.20	.61	104	4.74	1.02	.46	1.93	.05
Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of alternative ways of coping with conflict	20	4.85	.67	103	4.30	1.00	.55	2.33	.05
Describing, analyzing and diagnosing social conflict in organizational settings	19	4.94	.77	104	4.17	1.21	.77	2.66	.01
Accepting conflict as a natural part of social reality	20	5.30	.97	103	4.91	1.18	.39	1.37	NS
Applying your workshop learnings to your backhome setting	20	4.85	.98	102	4.07	1.24	.78	2.62	.01
Understanding the phenomena of power	20	5.30	.80	104	4.97	.92	.33	1.47	NS
Acquiring skills in using power	20	4.70	.92	104	4.28	1.17	.42	1.51	NS

Participant overall perceptions of the instructional content were assessed on the Final Questionnaire in terms of several criteria including relevance, clarity, practicality, interest and originality. These data are presented in Table 3.

The most highly rated aspects of the workshop content included: the workshop "spoke to important issues, vital concerns" (response of 5.15 on a 6-point scale), "ideas, skills, methods can be used immediately under existing conditions" (mean response of 4.80); "provided practical help for my actual group work" (mean response of 4.80); and "demanded much original thinking" (mean response of 4.75). The least favorably rated aspect of the workshop included: "clear, concise, understandable" (mean response of 4.05). Ratings of Orange County participants were statistically higher than for pilot test participants for two criteria: "spoke to important issues, vital concerns" ($t=2.10$, $P \leq .05$) and "provided much practical help for my actual group work" ($t=2.77$, $P \leq .01$). The other five criteria were rated nonstatistically higher except for "clear, concise, understandable," which was slightly lower.

Some particular theory papers were also rated by participants on the Session Evaluation Questionnaire. The data are presented in the next section on instructional procedures, Table 5. The mode response was "very good" for the Conflict Style Questionnaire, the conflict theory papers and the negotiative problem solving model papers.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROCEDURES

Recent revisions in the instructional procedures included a revision in the order of some of the activities, simplification of the NOG simulation data forms, revisions in the orientations to the NOG simulation and the Feudle simulation and expanded debriefing activities for the Conflict Style Questionnaire and the NOG simulation.

Table 3

Participants' Ratings of the Instructional Content

Question 2[a]	Only Restated or Proved What I Already Knew 1	2	3	4	5	Offered New Insights New Ways of Viewing Old Problems 6	N	$\bar{X}$
N	0	2	0	4	10	4	20	4.70
%	0	10	0	20	50	20		

Question 3	Missed the Important Issues, Vital Concerns 1	2	3	4	5	Spoke to Important Issues, Vital Concerns 6	N	$\bar{X}$
N	0	0	0	4	9	7	20	5.15
%	0	0	0	20	45	35		

Question 4	Hard to Understand Complex, Full of Jargon 1	2	3	4	5	Clear, Concise Understandable 6	N	$\bar{X}$
N	0	2	4	6	7	1	20	4.05
%	0	10	20	30	35	5		

Question 5	Usage Would Require Changes in Conditions That I Do Not Control 1	2	3	4	5	Ideas, Skills, Methods Can Be Used Immediately Under Existing Conditions 6	N	$\bar{X}$
N	0	1	1	2	13	3	20	4.80
%	0	5	5	10	65	15		

Question 6	Little Practical Help For My Actual Group Work 1	2	3	4	5	Provided Much Practical Help For My Actual Group Work 6	N	$\bar{X}$
N	0	1	1	4	9	5	20	4.80
%	0	5	5	20	45	25		

Question 7	Materials Failed to Interest Me 1	2	3	4	5	Materials Maintained My Interest 6	N	$\bar{X}$
N	0	0	2	7	7	4	20	4.65
%	0	0	10	35	35	20		

Question 8	Demanded No Original Thinking 1	2	3	4	5	Demanded Much Original Thinking 6	N	$\bar{X}$
N	0	0	0	7	11	2	20	4.75
%	0	0	0	35	55	10		

[a]General directions for all questions: Think for a moment about the informational materials and methods used in this workshop. All in all, how would you rate them?

Participant perceptions of the workshop procedures were also assessed in terms of several criteria: value of the practice exercises, use of session time, structure, time for personal growth, and sefulness of the simulations in developing skills and facilitating understanding about conflict. The results are provided in Table 4. The most highly rated aspect of workshop procedure were: the conflict simulation "greatly facilitated self-understanding about conflict" (mean response of 5.15) and "practice exercises were of great value" (mean response of 5.00). The least favorably rated aspect was: "session time was well used" (mean response of 4.15).

Ratings for workshop procedures were statistically higher for Orange County participants over pilot test participants in three areas: the value of the simulation in developing conflict coping skills ($t=2.12$, $P \geq .05$) and in facilitating self-understanding about conflict ($t=2.29$, $P \geq .05$) and in "practical exercises were of great value" ($t=1.79$, $P \geq .05$).

Participants also provided ratings of particular sessions using the Session Evaluation Questionnaire. The questionnaire asked for an overall rating for each session and then provided a set of specific criteria such as relevance or clarity to be checked when appropriate for each session. Table 5 presents participants' ratings of activities and materials in rank order from highest to lowest rated and also gives the order in which the activity took place in the workshop.

Participants tended to give higher overall ratings to activities near the end of the workshop and to activities containing conceptual and theoretical input. Higher ranking sessions were also rated high in the specific criterion of relevance.

Table 4

Participants' Ratings of the Instructional Procedures

Question 9	Practice Exercises Were of Little or No Value			Practice Exercises Were of Great Value			N	$\bar{X}$
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
N	0	0	0	5	10	5	20	5.00
%	0	0	0	25	50	25		

Question 10	Time in Sessions Was Wasted				Session Time Was Well Used		N	$\bar{X}$
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
N	0	2	3	7	6	2	20	4.15
%	0	10	15	35	30	10		

Question 11	Too Structured Blocked Learning				Structure Useful Promoted Learning		N	$\bar{X}$
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
N	1	0	2	5	7	5	20	4.60
%	5	0	10	25	35	25		

Question 12	Did Not Allow Time For Reflection About Self and Personal Growth			Allowed Time For Reflection About Self And Personal Growth			N	$\bar{X}$
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
N	1	2	1	5	4	7	20	4.50
%	5	10	5	25	20	35		

Question 31	Simulation Provided Little Help in Developing Conflict Coping Skills			Greatly Helped In Developing Conflict Coping Skills			N	$\bar{X}$
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
N	0	1	1	7	5	6	20	4.70
%	0	5	5	35	25	30		

Question 32	Simulation Provided Little Help With Self-Understanding About Conflict			Greatly Facilitated Self-Understanding About Conflict			N	$\bar{X}$
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
N	0	1	0	4	5	10	20	5.15
%	0	5	0	20	25	50		

Table 5

Participants Ratings of Specific Workshop Activities and Materials

Order of Occurrence in Workshop	Activity/Materials		Rating					N	$\bar{X}$
			Outstanding 5	Very Good 4	Satisfactory 3	Unsatisfactory 2	Extremely Poor 1		
15	Final Debriefing Discussions	N	8	6	4	0	0	18	4.22
		%	44	33	22	0	0		
14	NOG-II Simulation	N	6	8	3	0	0	17	4.18
		%	35	47	18	0	0		
12	Simulation Issue Clarification	N	6	5	6	0	0	17	4.00
		%	35	29	35	0	0		
13	NOG-I Round 4	N	4	8	4	0	0	16	4.00
		%	50	50	25	0	0		
4	Conflict Style Questionnaire	N	4	8	5	0	0	17	3.94
		%	24	47	29	0	0		
2	Conflict Theory Papers	N	2	12	4	0	0	18	3.89
		%	11	67	22	0	0		
5	NPS Model Papers	N	5	6	4	3	0	18	3.72
		%	28	33	22	17	0		
3	NOG-I Round 1	N	2	8	5	1	0	16	3.69
		%	13	50	31	6	0		
11	Draw a picture	N	3	4	7	2	0	16	3.50
		%	19	25	44	13	0		
8	Assertiveness Training	N	1	6	10	0	0	17	3.47
		%	6	35	59	0	0		
10	NOG-I Round 3	N	1	7	5	2	1	16	3.31
		%	6	44	31	13	6		
9	NOG-I Round 2	N	1	5	7	3	1	17	3.12
		%	6	29	41	18	6		
7	Backhome Exercise	N	0	4	7	6	0	17	2.88
		%	0	24	41	35	0		
1	NOG Orientation Round	N	0	3	8	6	0	17	2.82
		%	0	18	47	35	0		
6	Feudle Exercises	N	1	3	5	6	2	17	2.71
		%	6	18	29	35	12		

There were only two sessions in which a majority of participants checked having a problem along one or more of the specific rating criteria. These were the Feudle Exercise and the NOG orientation round. The down rated criteria included clarity of directions, clarity of concepts, interference from group or interpersonal problems, relevance, interest and amount learned. The data from the specific criteria of the activites questionnaire have been given to the developers to facilitate their work

in strengthening the system. These data were considered too specific and detailed for this summary report.

DISSEMINATION

Most of the information related to dissemination was obtained from the expert review and is presented in *Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving: Expert Review* (1976). Two openended items on the Final Questionnaire (Questions 29, 30) were also used to determine how participants expect to use the ideas, skills and materials in their work situation and whether they plan to use the workshop materials to train others. The data is being used to look at implications for dissemination. The analysis is not completed at this time.

PARTICIPANT SATISFACTION

Six items on the Final Questionnaire assessed general workshop satisfaction; the results are presented in Table 6. In an item asking participants how they would sum up the workshop experience, all participants responded favorably. The mode response was 5 on a 6-point scale ranging from "1" equals "not very worthwhile" to "6" equals "extremely worthwhile." Results were the same for participants' perceptions of the expected usefulness of the workshop. When asked how much they planned to use the ideas, skills and/or materials presented in the workshop, the mode response was 5 on a 6-point scale, ranging from "1" equals "not at all" to "6" equals "extensively."

In the third item participants indicated the extent to which the workshop met their expectations. Again, the mode response is 5 on a 6-point scale, ranging from "1" equals "has not come up to my expectations" to "6" equals "has exceeded my expectations." However, for this item, there were three non-respondents and three responses of three or less.

Table 6

Participants' Responses to General Indicators of Satisfaction with the Workshop

Question 34[a]	Workshop Not Very Worthwhile 1	2	3	4	5	Extremely Worthwhile 6	N	$\bar{X}$
N	0	0	0	2	11	7	20	5.25
%	0	0	0	10	55	35		
Question 29[b]	No Use At All 1	2	3	4	5	Plan Extensive Use Of Ideas, Skills, Materials 6	N	$\bar{X}$
N	0	0	0	6	8	6	20	5.00
%	0	0	0	30	40	30		
Question 1[c]	Workshop Has Not Come Up To My Expectations 1	2	3	4	5	Exceeded My Expectations 6	N	$\bar{X}$
N	0	1	2	4	8	2	17	4.47
%	0	6	12	24	47	12		
Question 13[d]	Low Potential For Organizational Improvements 1	2	3	4	5	High Potential 6	N	$\bar{X}$
N	1	0	0	3	10	6	20	4.95
%	5	0	0	15	50	30		
Question 14[e]	Compares Very Low To Other Professional Education Courses 1	2	3	4	5	Compares Very High 6	N	$\bar{X}$
N	0	0	0	4	9	7	20	5.15
%	0	0	0	20	45	35		

[a]Question 31: Now that the workshop/course is over, how would you sum up the experience?

[b]Question 26: In all honesty, how much do you plan to use the ideas, skills and/or materials presented in this workshop as an integral part of your work?

[c]Question 1: To what extent has this workshop fulfilled your expectations about what you personally might get out of it?

[d]Question 13: Considering this workshop as a training program for colleges and school districts: How would you rate it in terms of its potential for organizational improvement?

[e]Question 14: Considering this workshop as a training program for colleges and school districts: How would you rate this workshop compared to other professional education courses you have taken?

Participants also rated the workshop high for its potential for organizational improvement (mode response of 5) and high compared to professional education courses and noneducation college courses (modes of 5 and 6 respectively).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

The results of the evaluation indicate that most participants thought the workshop was very worthwhile and generally met their expectations. Participants were more positive in their ratings than participants of past workshops.

From the participant's point of view the workshop might also be stregthened in a number of respects. Acquiring negotiation skills was rated lower than other objectives, as was acquiring skills in using power. Some participants still find the content somewhat "hard to understand, comples, full of jargon." Some still think session time could be used more efficiently. The data indicate that participants are having difficulties with the Feudle Exercise and the orientation to the NOG simulation. (Feudle is the title of a simulation designed to help participants learn about power.) Some of these problems may be resolved, but others may remain subject to confirmation by additional sources of information. For example, acquisition of negotiation skills may require more training and practice than can be provided in this workshop.

The data provided in this report consist primarily of participant ratings. This is only one source of information which needs to be balanced by other kinds of information. For example, are participants' responses and actions during the workshop consistent with the developers' expectations? It is recommended that evaluation of the next workshop be focused on an analysis of the workshop process. For example, for which tasks and content areas do participants' responses and actions indicate that they are willing to participate and attend to task, or

able to grasp the material and use it in the simulations, or apply it to themselves? When do participants' responses indicate that they are resisting an activity, too threatened to grasp what is going on or unwilling to try a new response? Then, how do these responses relate to the training procedures and content or participant's expectations? Such observational data will be useful to the developers in structuring the workshop so that participants are able to choose responses that facilitate their growth or in removing acitivites in which participants consistently respond in inappropriate ways.

REFERENCES

Improving Teaching Competencies Program. *Proposal and Resource Allocation Management Plan (RAMP).* Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. October 1975.

Lohman, J. E., G. Milczarek and C. Germann. *Planning Milestone Report for Conflict and Negotiations in Education Work Unit.* Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. March 1974.

Lohman, John E. and Gretchen G. Wilson. *Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving.* Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. July 1975.

Milczarek, Gary J. *Pilot Milestone Report for Social Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving.* Portland, Oregon. November 1975.

APPENDIX A

Evaluation Instruments

NAME CODE ☐☐☐☐

Workshop #:
Location:
Trainers:

BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name _____ Sex ____ Age _____

2. _____
Mailing address Street City State Zip

(This is necessary for followup information) Phone ____ ; ____ - _____

3. Occupation _____ Years in occupation _____

Position or Job Title _____ Years in this position _____

Give a brief description of what you do on the job:

4. Check the highest degree obtained: ___ B.A. ___M.A. ___Ph.D. or Ed.D.

Area of specialization

5. Participation in other ICP/NWREL systems:

___Interaction Analysis
___Facilitating Inquiry
___Higher Level Thinking
___RUPS
___SAFE
___Conflict-Negotiations
___REAL
___Interpersonal Communications
___Interpersonal Influence
___Group Process Skills
___PETC I
___PETC II
___TRIM
___PETC III

6. Briefly describe any training or experience you have had in the area of conflict and negotiations:

7. Briefly describe what you expect from this workshop:

NAME CODE | | | | |

Workshop #:
Site:
Trainers:

FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. To what extent has this workshop fulfilled your expectations about what you personally might get out of it? (CHECK ONE BOX)

Has not come up to my expectations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Has exceeded my expectations

Please give specific examples of why the workshop did or did not fulfill your expectations.

Think for a moment about the informational materials, practice exercises and methods used in this workshop. All in all, how would you rate them? (CHECK ONE BOX IN EACH LINE)

2. Only restated or proved what I already know | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Offered new insights, new ways of viewing old problems

3. Spoke to important issues, vital concerns | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Missed the important issues, vital concerns

4. Hard to understand, complex, full of jargon | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Clear, concise, understandable

5. Ideas, skills, methods can be used immediately under existing conditions | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Usage would require changes in conditions that I do not control

FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

6.	Little practical help for my actual group work	1 2 3 4 5 6	Provided much practical help for my actual group work
7.	Material maintained my interest	6 5 4 3 2 1	Material failed to interest me
8.	Demanded much original thinking	6 5 4 3 2 1	Demanded no original thinking
9.	Practice exercises were of little or no value	1 2 3 4 5 6	Practice exercises were of great value
10.	Session time was well used	6 5 4 3 2 1	Time in the sessions was wasted
11.	Structure useful, promoted learning	6 5 4 3 2 1	Too structured, blocked learning
12.	Allowed time for reflection about self and personal growth	6 5 4 3 2 1	Did not allow time for reflection about self and personal growth

Considering this workshop as a training program for colleges and school districts -- (CHECK ONE SPACE FOR EACH QUESTION)

13. How would you rate it in terms of its potential for organizational improvement?

Low potential 1 2 3 4 5 6 High potential

14. How would you rate this workshop compared to other professional education courses you have taken?

Very low 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very high

15. How would you rate this workshop compared to other college courses (noneducation) you have taken?

Very low 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very high

FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

In order to adequately assess the instructional system of the workshop, it is necessary to know as accurately as possible if it achieves the desired objectives. As a result of your participation in the workshop, how much help do you feel the system was to you in gaining skills and knowledge of the following? (MARK ONE BOX FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING)

16. Understanding a negotiative problem solving model

Great amount of help	6	5	4	3	2	1	Very little help

17. Acquiring skills in a negotiative problem solving model

Great amount of help	6	5	4	3	2	1	Very little help

18. Understanding your own style of coping with conflict.

Great amount of help	6	5	4	3	2	1	Very little help

19. Gaining your awareness of alternative ways of coping with conflict.

Great amount of help	6	5	4	3	2	1	Very little help

20. Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of alternative ways of coping with conflict.

Great amount of help	6	5	4	3	2	1	Very little help

21. Describing, analyzing and diagnosing social conflict in organizational settings

Great amount of help	6	5	4	3	2	1	Very little help

22. Accepting conflict as a natural part of social reality

Great amount of help	6	5	4	3	2	1	Very little help

23. Applying your workshop learnings to your backhome setting

Great amount of help	6	5	4	3	2	1	Very little help

FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

24. Understanding major concepts and principles related to Conflict and Negotiative Problem Solving:

Great amount of help | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Very little help

25. Recognizing my legitimate self-interests in conflict situations:

Great amount of help | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Very little help

26. Recognizing and accepting the legitimacy of self-interests of others:

Great amount of help | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Very little help

27. Understanding the phenomena of power

Great amount of help | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Very little help

28. Acquiring skills in using power

Great amount of help | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Very little help

29. In all honesty, how much do you plan to use the ideas, skills and/or materials presented in this workshop as an integral part of your work?

Extensively | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Not at all

If you checked (6) or (5), give 3 specific samples of how you plan to use the material presented in the workshop.

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

30. Do you have any plans for using the materials you worked with in this workshop to train others? ___No ___Yes

Would you share with us what you have in mind?

How helpful or useful did you find the conflict simulation? (CHECK ONE BOX IN EACH LINE)

31. Greatly helped in developing conflict coping skills

6	5	4	3	2	1

Little help in developing conflict coping skills

32. Little help with self-understanding about conflict

1	2	3	4	5	6

Greatly facilitated self-understanding about conflict

33. Please describe five or six of your most important learnings or insights from this workshop.

FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

34. Now that the workshop/course is over, how would you sum up the experience?

Not very worthwhile	1	2	3	4	5	6	Extremely worthwhile

What are the major factors contributing to your assessment?

NAME CODE [ ][ ][ ][ ]

1 = Outstanding
2 = Very Good
3 = Satisfactory
4 = Unsatisfactory
5 = Extremely Poor

Activity or Paper Number

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
What is your overall rating of this activity or paper?																				

Please indicate your reactions to the activity or paper in terms of the following characteristics. Use the following code:

1 = Major Problem
2 = Minor Problem
3 = Especially Favorable Reaction
Blank = No Problem

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1. Clear, easy to understand directions vs. unclear difficult to understand directions																				
2. Clear, understandable concepts, ideas vs. unclear, fuzzy concepts, ideas																				
3. Important, relevant vs. unimportant, not relevant																				
4. Challenging, stimulating vs. boring, uninteresting																				
5. Learned a great deal v. learned very little																				
6. Group or interpersonal problems got in the way																				
7. I disagree with the ideas presented																				
8. Nothing wrong with the activity, I was distracted for personal reasons																				
9. Other (What?)																				
10. Other (What?)																				

On the reverse side please make any additional comments you wish by noting the activity or paper number and giving your comment.